

throughout its history, given much less importance to the public service. While they were respected in Canada, bureaucratic careers have often been downgraded in the United States. In order to avoid what was considered to be a dangerous "routinization" of the bureaucracy — far from the virtues of private enterprise — fresh recruits from other sectors of society have constantly been called upon to administer the state. In other words, American society has depreciated the permanent public service, whereas the Canadian experience has been to grant great moral authority to public servants.

Finally, by once refusing to take part in the revolutionary adventure, Canadians seem to have been immunized against any sudden or flamboyant change. They have built a society that is just as democratic as American society, but democracy has come slowly, without recourse to grand proclamations. Canadians rejected radical transformations at the time when Papi-neau and Mackenzie were clamouring for them. But shortly afterwards they obtained responsible government, followed by universal suffrage, and, quietly, democracy gained ground just as determinedly as in the United States.

There was never a declaration of independence in Canada. The Canadian constitution is still under the jurisdiction of the British Parliament. Nevertheless, Canada is most certainly a sovereign state, at least, if its sovereignty is endangered, the threat does not come from London.

Reflects moderation

Canadian foreign policy, which acquired independence little by little, clearly reflects this moderation. American diplomacy, in contrast, has often been marked by the flamboyant style of its origins. The successive Presidents of the United States have felt the need to make Washington-style declarations of principle or, following Monroe, to establish "doctrines". For their

part, Canadian leaders have sought to champion conciliation, moderation and patience. Even now that we are deliberately trying to put into effect a policy of independence (typically stated as an "option" rather than a doctrine), we are doing it slowly, gradually, taking great care not to injure anyone in the process and, at every gesture that tends to make us more independent of the United States, proclaiming our indestructible friendship toward our American neighbours.

As a fifth characteristic of Canadian foreign policy, we might make reference to the fact that it reflects a cultural duality. Although a number of French Canadians have played an important role in Canadian diplomacy, it is difficult to see how they have contributed, as such, towards shaping a Canadian style. It is quite clear that modern-day Quebec has encouraged a marked involvement of Canada's foreign policy in matters relating to the French-speaking world community. However, it may be a few years before Quebec, as a political entity, comes to have a significant effect on Canadian diplomacy. In the meantime, we can always point out that Canada's foreign policy is expressed in two languages, something that already distinguishes it from that of the United States.

None of these differences, which, in the final analysis, may be more likely to enrich relations between the United States and Canada than to create conflict, can cancel out the inescapable fact of the common destiny of these two North American countries. None of the "Third Options" or other products of Canadian nationalism, as sound and successful as they may be — or even the possible appearance of a new actor in the form of a sovereign Quebec —, will be able to alter significantly this fact of life. Through their historical experience, their culture, their economy and their drive, Canada and the United States will always be, for better or for worse, closely bound to each other.

*Cultural duality
reflected
in Canadian
foreign policy*